| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|--|---|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 09/463,681 | BLUM ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Kishor Mayekar | 1753 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application | n: |
| (1) Kishor Mayekar. | (3) | |
| (2) Christopher M. Beck. | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 22 March 2004 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | cant's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| | | |
| Claims discussed: 1, 5-7, 9 and 10. | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Prior art of record | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN | | |
| to remove minor inconsistencies in claims 5-7 by replacing the "product-by-process" claims not distinguishabble from the prior | claims with new claims 20-22 r art; and to amend claim 1 by | 2; to delete claims 9 and 10 as an examnier's amendment. |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To fit the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ | the examiner will provide a e record of the substance of | of the interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica | ant/Applicant's Representat | ive Signature – if appropriate) |